

entire city was declared to be a "Land," or state, of West Germany. Reservations made by the allied military governors on May 4, 1949, and reaffirmed in 1955, when West Germany joined NATO, restricted German sovereignty so as not to compromise the special status of the city. But now that that status has been drastically undermined by the Communists, West Berlin cannot be left dangling as a kind of third Germany. The city's loose and informal association with West Germany is indeed something that can be considered a fact, one that is far more genuine and meaningful than the East German regime. And as long as West Berlin remains isolated and exposed, more than a hundred miles from the nearest friendly territory, western troops must be there to protect the city's freedom. The size of these troop units may make the allied military presence in Berlin seem merely symbolic. Yet it is an armed symbol, and the determination with which it is maintained can provide a very effective guarantee of security to the nations of the West and of hope to the peoples of the East. And as long as the Russians refuse to live up to their agreement on the reunification of Germany, they must be required to respect our rights of access to Berlin.

ACCORDINGLY, the restrictions placed on West German sovereignty in Berlin could now be formally withdrawn. Berlin, though still occupied by allied military forces, could formally pass into the governmental jurisdiction of the Federal German Republic, and the West Berlin representatives in the Bundestag and Bundestat, who now sit as nonvoting members, could be given full legal status. This would be a logical sequel to the use of a common currency, close economic ties, and many laws in common between West Berlin and the Federal German Republic.

It would not be necessary to amend the Basic Law of West Germany or the Berlin constitution. Incorporation could be accomplished by holding a plebiscite to determine the will of the people and by a joint declaration of the United States, France, and the United Kingdom. By thus fully integrating West Berlin into


the German Federal Republic, close ties could be maintained between the city and West Germany while at the same time, our guarantees not to let West Berlin fall to the Communists would be preserved.

So long as this step is regarded as a basic move in the fulfillment of the allied obligation to reunify Germany, the Soviet Union could not object on valid legal grounds. And yet the Russians would be confronted with an accomplished fact that would certainly have to be taken into account in any negotiations over the future of Berlin. Heretofore, it has been the Russians who have presented us with accomplished facts—the main difference being that they have effected changes by illegal means of military force, whereas the change we would make would be based on a perfectly legal agreement between the people of West Berlin and the people of West Germany.

It has recently been reported that West Germany and West Berlin have been encouraged—perhaps by the

President of the United States—to work out a "new contractual basis" for their relationship. It is not yet clear what all this might involve, but it would seem that the creation of new legal bonds between two sections of West Germany might add a number of new difficulties to an already difficult situation. The Russians, too, might want to have a voice in the matter. No such difficulties would be presented by the integration of West Berlin into the German Federal Republic, since the step would involve only the formal ratification of old and fully established economic, political, and spiritual bonds.

IN THE PAST our policy on Germany has been criticized as a weak one because we have apparently sought only to maintain the status quo. It has been repeatedly said that the status quo should be improved. What I am suggesting is that the status quo be improved in the interest not only of Berlin but of the West.



## Foggybottomology

MEG GREENFIELD

*The following appraisal of the recent reorganization of the State Department fell into our hands quite by accident. It was apparently prepared by one of those specialists in modern political machinations known as Kremlinologists. We are happy to publish it as our contribution to cultural exchange and international understanding.*

A STUDY of the recent power shift in Washington leads to the inescapable conclusion that the hand of Foreign Minister D. Rusk has either been strengthened or weakened. It is

not without significance that three of those who were elevated to full membership in the State Department—W. W. Rostow, W. A. Harriman, and R. N. Goodwin—all have been identified with the Northeast section of the country, while G. McGhee, whose influence appears to have risen, comes from the South.

The emphasis on these two regions where party members are known to have remained loyal to Mr. Kennedy in the 1960 power struggle may well mean that the party has finally seized control of the State Department. Viewed in this light, the communi-